

wherein the at least one interface ~~is~~ configured by at least one of a primary logic unit [and/or] and the unit itself [(see Figures 8, 11)].

A4 13. (Amended) The bus system according to claim 1, [characterized in that] wherein standard bus systems [can be] are used [(see Figure 12)].

14. (Amended) The bus system according to claim 1, [characterized in that] wherein the unit [has] includes additional ordinary connections in [the] a manner customary with at least one of the DFP, the FPGA and the DPGA [DFPs, FPGAs, DPGAs, etc. (see Figure 12, 1201, 1204)].

Please add the following new claims:

A5 17. (New) The bus system according to claim ~~14~~¹⁶, wherein the logic cell is a cell in at least one of the DFP, the FPGA, the DPGA and a unit that fulfills at least one of simple logical functions and arithmetic functions according to the configuration.

Remarks

I. INTRODUCTION

The drawings stand objected to due to noted informalities. The specification stands objected to due to noted informalities. Claim 19 has been added. Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 1 stands objected to due to noted informalities. Claims 1-18 stand objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,113,498 ("Evan"). Claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Evan. Claims 11 and 14-16 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Claim 1-18 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

II. OBJECTION WITH RESPECT TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner maintains that the drawings should be amended to include suitable descriptive legends. Furthermore, the Examiner maintains that the Figures 1-3 should be labeled as prior art.

As per the suggestion of the Examiner, Applicants have amended the drawings as indicated in the attached red-marked sheets. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn with respect to the drawings.

III. OBJECTION WITH RESPECT TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner maintains that in the brief description of the drawings, "Fig. 4" should be replaced with --Figs. 4a and 4b--, "Fig. 9" should be replaced with --Figs. 9a and 9b--, and "Fig. 10" should be replaced with --Figs. 10a-10g--.

As per the suggestion of the Examiner, Applicants have amended the specification. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn with respect to the specification.

IV. OBJECTION WITH RESPECT TO CLAIM 1

Claim 1 stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner maintains that Applicants should define abbreviations DFP, FPGA and DPGA along with the abbreviations in parenthesis first before using the abbreviations alone anywhere in the claims.

As per the suggestion of the Examiner, Applicants have amended the subject matter as set forth in claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn with respect to claim 1.

V. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS 1-18

Claims 1-18 stand objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite.

In claim 1, the Examiner maintains that the phrase "type" is indefinite and that the phrase "as well as all units having a two- or multi-dimensional programmable cell

architecture by means of which multiple units can be combined and/or memories and/or peripherals can be connected" is vague. Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify the subject matter as set forth in claim 1.

In claims 6-8, the Examiner maintains that the word "may" is indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 6-8 to further clarify the subject matter as set forth in claims 6-8.

In claim 14, the Examiner maintains that the phrase "similar units" is vague and indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 14 to further clarify the subject matter as set forth in claim 14. Furthermore, some of the subject matter as set forth in the original claim 14 has been inserted in a new claim 19.

In claim 18, the Examiner maintains, presumably, that the word "etc." is indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 18 to further clarify the subject matter as set forth in claim 18.

For at least the above remarks, Applicants believe that claims 1-18 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, be withdrawn with respect to claims 1-18.

**VI. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)
WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS 1 AND 2**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Evan.

Evan does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 1. For example, Evan does not describe a bundled plurality of at least one of individual lines, buses and subbuses *within* the units as set forth in claim 1. Instead, Evans describes an MD bus and an AD bus which are not bundled and are not within the multi-processor 100. For at least the above reasons, Evan does not anticipate the subject matter as set forth in claim 1 and claim 2, which depends from claim 1.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn with respect to claims 1 and 2.

**VII. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) WITH
RESPECT TO CLAIMS 3-10, 12, 13, 17 AND 18**

Claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

obvious in view of Evan.

Applicants respectfully submit that Evan does even teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in claim 1. For example, Evan does not teach or suggest a bundled plurality of at least one of individual lines, buses and subbuses *within* the units as set forth in claim 1. Instead, Evans describes an MD bus and an AD bus which are not bundled and are not within the multi-processor 100. Accordingly, Evans teaches away from the subject matter as set forth in claim 1. Since Evan does not render obvious the subject matter as set forth in claim 1, Evan does not render obvious the subject matter as set forth in claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18, which depend from claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that elements as set forth in claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are not "well known" at least in the context of the present invention. In accordance with M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, the Examiner is requested to provide a reference supporting all of the elements that the Examiner maintains to be "well known" if the Examiner wishes to maintain the rejection. If any of the rejections are, instead, facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner, the Examiner is requested to support the rejections with an affidavit setting forth the facts upon which the Examiner's rejection is based. 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2).

In addition, Applicants respectfully draw the attention of the Examiner to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 which states, with respect to official notice, that facts so noticed serve to fill the gaps which might exist in the evidentiary showing and should not comprise the principle evidence upon which a rejection is based. See In re Ahlert, 424 F. 2d 1088, 1091, 165 U.S.P.Q. 418, 420-421 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 were improperly rejected principally on noticed facts.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn with respect to claims 3-10, 12, 13, 17 and 18.

VIII. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 11 and 14-16 include allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.


Claims 11, 14 and 15 have been amended to be rewritten in independent form. Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Claims 11 and 14-16 have also been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 14-16 are in condition for allowance.

IX. CONCLUSION

In light of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9 Nov 2000

By: 
Michelle Carniaux
Reg. No. 36,098

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

311557